

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

In response to the rejection of claims 36-42 under 35 U.S.C. §101, the Examiner's suggestion for obviating this ground of rejection has been adopted by the above amendment.

In response to the rejection of claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, it is noted that this ground of rejection was probably intended for claim 38 instead of claim 37. In that regard, the above amendment also obviates this ground of rejection.

Accordingly, all formal issues are now believed to have been resolved in the applicant's favor.

The rejection of claims 23-42 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by Hacherl '571 is respectfully traversed.

Hacherl is concerned with the problem of tasks carried out by servers in a distributed operating system. In a distributed operating system some tasks are best performed by a single server rather than by multiple servers, but placing all these tasks on one master server can lead to problems. Thus Hacherl proposes the solution of distributing the tasks between the servers, and allowing one server to take over another server's task when necessary.

By contrast, the applicant's independent claims 23, 29, 35 and 36 require duplicated objects and the necessity to keep them identical. These are not distributed, where the set of data and the necessary tasks are split up and given to various servers so that one server does not become overloaded. Duplicated objects include data and instructions, and are kept identical across a plurality of computers. There is no disclosure of duplicated objects in Hacherl.

The Examiner has indicated that he considers replicas of the directory service on the servers to be duplicated objects, but these are simply data and not instructions, and thus not

duplicated objects in the sense of the present application. (The use of the term “object” in Hacherl is defined at column 6, lines 36-41 as a collection of attributes, i.e. data only.)

Further, the applicant’s independent claims require that one of the duplicated data objects is established as a master data object. Even if the replicated directory service were considered to be a duplicated object, Hacherl does not disclose establishing one of the replicas as a master. Instead, Hacherl discloses allocation of a single task to each of the servers, thus removing any notion of a “master” role and distributing it over the network.

Further, the applicant’s independent claims require that the master data object be responsible for maintaining consistency between data in the duplicated objects. None of the tasks disclosed by Hacherl relate to maintaining consistency. Rather, as disclosed at column 7, lines 38-62, each server is responsible for its own replication and received objects overwrite existing objects, removing any problem with consistency. The tasks of Hacherl (discussed at column 8, line 65 to column 9, line 32) are all necessary for a distributed operating system but are irrelevant to duplicated objects.

Thus Hacherl has major deficiencies *vis-a-vis* applicant’s independent claims.

Given the fundamental deficiencies already noted with respect to independent claims, it is not believed necessary at this time to detail the further deficiencies of Hacherl with respect to other features of the independent claims or features of the various dependent claims. That is, as a matter of law, it is impossible for a reference to anticipate any claim unless it teaches all features of that claim.

DIONNE et al.
Appl. No. 09/735,925
September 4, 2007

Accordingly, all outstanding issues are now believed to have been resolved in the applicant's favor and a formal notice of allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Larry S. Nixon/
Larry S. Nixon
Reg. No. 25,640

LSN:tlm
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100